

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 20-31 have been canceled. New claims 44 and 45 have been added. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17-19, 32, 40, and 41 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The remarks below refer to the claims as amended herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0002474 to Alexander et al (“Alexander) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,486,739 to Franaszek et al (“Franaszek”).

Claim 1 recites, in part:

arranging the signal lines within the plurality of segments such that an order of the signal lines in the first segment is different than an order of the signal lines in the second segment, and an order of the signal lines in the third segment is different than the order of the signal lines in both the first and the second segments.

Alexander discloses a merging network for rearranging parallel data streams received at the inputs into interleaved data words at the outputs (Alexander, paragraph [0100]). In reference to Figures 8A-8F, Alexander discloses a butterfly network (41), comprising shift registers 41A-41D and multiplexers 42A-42H, for passing data streams received at the inputs A-D to the outputs 44 (0-3) (Alexander, paragraphs [0106]-[0115]). Applicant submits that the data streams in Alexander may be passed, *via the multiplexers*, from their specified inputs (A-D) to any of the various outputs (44) of the network. Nowhere does Alexander suggest or disclose “arranging the signal lines within the plurality of segments such that *an order of the signal lines in the first segment is different than an order of the signal lines in the second segment*, and an order of the signal lines in the third segment is different than the order of the signal lines in both the first and the second segments,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant further submits that Franaszek also does not disclose at least the above-recited limitation of claim 1. Thus, even if Alexander

and Franaszek could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation of claim 1, and therefore would not have rendered claim 1 obvious.

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,038,240 to Schelkunoff et al (“Schelkunoff”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,486,739 to Franaszek et al (“Franaszek”).

Claim 1 recites, in part:

arranging the signal lines within the plurality of segments such that an order of the signal lines in the first segment is different than an order of the signal lines in the second segment, and an order of the signal lines in the third segment is different than the order of the signal lines in both the first and the second segments.

Schelkunoff discloses a method of reducing the effects of signal induction between parallel signaling circuits by *varying the thickness, conductivity, or permeability of the outer conductor* of a coaxial conductor line that is divided into a plurality of longitudinal sections such that the waves extending from the outer conductor of one section are in phase opposition to those extending from the outer conductor of adjacent sections (Schelkunoff, col. 2 lines 35-51, Fig. 1). Nowhere does Schelkunoff disclose or suggest “arranging the signal lines within the plurality of segments such that *an order of the signal lines in the first segment is different than an order of the signal lines in the second segment*, and an order of the signal lines in the third segment is different than the order of the signal lines in both the first and the second segments,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant further submits that Franaszek also does not disclose at least the above-recited limitation of claim 1. Thus, even if Schelkunoff and Franaszek could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation of claim 1, and therefore would not have rendered claim 1, nor dependent claims 2-7, obvious.

Claim 8 recites, in part:

wherein an order of the signal lines in the first segment is different than an order of the signal lines in the second segment, and an order of the signal lines in the third segment is different than the order of the signal lines in both the first and the second segments.

Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 1, even if Schelkunoff and Franaszek could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation and therefore would not have rendered claim 8, nor dependent claims 9-19, obvious.

Claim 32 recites, in part:

three or more signal lines forming at least three possible pairs of signal lines, a respective interline coupling parameter being associated with a respective pair of signal lines, each pair of at least two different pairs of signal lines among the possible pairs of signal lines being repositioned in the interconnection to reduce differences in interline coupling parameters associated with the at least three possible pairs of signal lines.

Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 1, neither Schelkunoff nor Franaszek discloses, “each pair of at least two different pairs of signal lines among the possible pairs of signal lines *being repositioned in the interconnection* to reduce differences in interline coupling parameters associated with the at least three possible pairs of signal lines,” as recited in claim 32. Thus, even if Schelkunoff and Franaszek could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation and therefore would not have rendered claim 32, nor dependent claims 33-43, obvious.

In Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

A petition for a 2 month extension of time is enclosed herewith.

Authorization is hereby given to charge deposit account 501914 for any fee deficiency associated with this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMDEI LLP

Date November 19, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles E. Shemwell', written over a horizontal line.

Charles E. Shemwell, Reg. No. 40,171
Tel. 408-236-6645